

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,633	DILLING, GARY	
	Examiner Katherine W. Mitchell	Art Unit 3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell. (3) _____.

(2) Ralph Gelling. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 May 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 2,4,5 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: no.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner called first to say the claims were allowable and offered to consider additional cancelled dependent claims now that independent claim was allowable, as applicant has clearly shown a desire to work toward allowable subject matter and expedite the case. Unfortunately, examiner called back to state that a final review of the entire case could not find support for the added limitation --a driver with non-driving surfaces constructed in grooves between driving surfaces of spirally shaped walls.-- in the originally filed application spec, drawings, or claims, and thus it would be new matter. Examiner did review document incorporated by reference, USP 5,957,645 and cannot find support for the added matter. Examiner agreed to considered an amendment after final that documents suport for the limitaiton.

After several iterations, alloable subject matter was agreed to, per attached examiners amendment, and the applicant showed examiner that the driver was explicitly referred to as a "standard driver" in both this applicantion and incorporatd by reference '645, and thus the driver is not new matter.